

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-51 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 47 and 51 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

***Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) as being anticipated by Timothy Bickmore et al., "Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users", The Computer Journal, Volume 42, No. 6, 1999 ("Bickmore"). This rejection is traversed.

According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, a font used in the wireless device is determined by the gateway server based on specific types of information in order to provide correct formatting to the wireless device. That is, according to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, the gateway server (or the user control server/font server connected to the gateway server) has access to information about the wireless device or the wireless user, for example, by reference to a user information database which includes user information, or can obtain such information, for example, with reference to a language used by the wireless client, in order to provide formatting for the wireless client.

For at least the following reasons, Applicant's claimed invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious from the cited art, including Bickmore. By way of example, independent claims 1, 12, 29 and 51 require determining the font by reference to at least one of a language selected in the wireless client and a user information database which

includes user information stored in advance. Further, independent claim 21 requires, *inter alia*, a font which is determined by the gateway server based on the language notified to the gateway server. Moreover, claims 37 and 47 require, *inter alia*, a user control server (claim 37)/ a font server (claim 47) connected to the wireless device via the gateway server, that includes a font determining unit for determining a font to be transferred to the wireless client, the font determining unit determining the font by reference to at least one of a language selected in the wireless client and a user information database which includes user information stored in advance.

Bickmore discloses re-authoring Web documents for the display needs of wireless devices through a series of transformations performed on the Web document (Bickmore, Paragraphs 2.4 and 2.6). Bickmore discloses a Digestor system, in which users of the wireless device specify a sizable font in order to allow the system to estimate a screen area of a text block to configure the Digestor system (Bickmore, Paragraph 3.1). Bickmore further discloses a series of rules to be kept in mind in designing the image reduction and re-authoring techniques.

Bickmore does not disclose or suggest a gateway server (or a font server per independent claim 37, or a control server, per independent claim 47, connected to the gateway server) that determines a font to be transferred to the wireless client, the font determining unit determining the font by reference to at least one of a language selected in the wireless client and a user information database which includes user information stored in advance. Further, Bickmore does not disclose or suggest a font which is determined and sent from the gateway server, the font determined by reference to at least one of a language selected in the wireless client and a user information database which

includes user information stored in advance, as *inter alia*, required by independent claim 21.

Therefore, Bickmore does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 47 and 51. In fact, Bickmore belongs to the prior art recognized by Applicant's claimed invention because Bickmore does not disclose or suggest the solutions provided by Applicant's claimed invention.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1, claim 16 depends from independent claim 12, and claim 40 depends from independent claim 37. Therefore, claims 5, 16 and 40 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective independent base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

#### ***Rejection of claims 3, 14 and 22***

Claims 3, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious from over Bickmore and Kovacs. This rejection is traversed.

Kovacs does not qualify as prior art under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102, as discussed in the Amendment filed on June 29, 2004. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove Kovacs as a reference against the present Application.

Further, even if Kovacs did qualify as prior art, Kovacs does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 12 and 21, from which claims 3, 14 and 22 depend. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

***Rejection of Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious from Bickmore and the Official Notice taken by the Examiner. This rejection is traversed.

The Official Notice does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 37 and 47. Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 37 and 47, respectively, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof. Accordingly, claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective independent base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

***Rejection of claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42***

Claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious from Bickmore and Simon. This rejection is traversed.

Simon does not remedy the deficiencies of Bickmore as they relate to applicants invention and his claimed in independent claims 1, 21, 29 and 37. Therefore, since claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 depend from these independent base claims, claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 incorporate novel and nonobvious features thereof and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective independent base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection

should now be withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph***

Claims 21-28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Independent claims 21 and 29 are amended. This rejection should now be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



George Brieger  
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:ej